REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-11, 13, 16, 17, 19-29,

31, 34, 35, 42, and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Dahlén</u> (U.S. Patent No.

5,870,454) in view of <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0067806); rejected

claims 14, 15, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Dahlén</u> in view of

<u>Rodriguez et al.</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,314); rejected claims 18, 36, 43, and 44

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Dahlén</u> in view of <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> and <u>Fortman et</u>

<u>al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,100); rejected claims 37-40, 48, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

unpatentable over <u>Dahlén</u> in view of <u>Tullis et al.</u>; and rejected claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

as unpatentable over <u>Dahlén</u> in view of <u>Tullis et al.</u> and <u>Rodriguez et al.</u>

By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claim 13 without prejudice or disclaimer, and

amend claims 1, 10, 14, 19, 20, 31, 32, 37, 42, and 48 to improve form. Applicants respectfully

traverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 with regard to the amended claims.

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-29, and 31-49 are pending.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON <u>DAHLÉN</u> AND <u>RODRIGUEZ ET AL.</u>

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1-7, 9-11, 16,

17, 19-29, 31, 34, 35, 42, and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over

<u>Dahlén</u> in view of <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> Applicants traverse the rejection with regard to the amended

claims.

Amended independent claim 1, for example, is directed to a method for delivering a

message to a receiving party. The method comprises receiving a message and one or more

message attachments intended for the receiving party, the message being received in a source

- 15 -

message format and the one or more message attachments being received in a source attachment

format; determining whether the message should be delivered to the receiving party; translating

the message from the source message format to message text and the one or more message

attachments from the source attachment format into attachment text; converting the message text

and the attachment text to an audible message when the message should be delivered to the

receiving party; determining a date or time at which the audible message should be delivered;

initiating a telephony call to the receiving party at the determined date or time; and delivering the

audible message to the receiving party during the telephony call.

Neither Dahlén nor Rodriguez et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable

combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in amended claim 1. For

example, neither Dahlén nor Rodriguez et al. discloses or suggests translating a message from a

source message format to message text and one or more message attachments from a source

attachment format into attachment text.

The Examiner alleged that Dahlén discloses these features and cited column 6, lines 5-32,

and column 7, lines 10-25, of Dahlén for support (Office Action, page 3). Applicants

respectfully disagree.

At column 6, lines 5-32, Dahlén discloses:

> At step 236 the prompter & collector inquires whether calling party 22 wishes to attach a
> file. File attachment means that calling party 22 wishes to include in the message a copy
> of a standard message. The standard message can be one or more routine messages which
> are prone to use by many calling parties and hence generally available or, in a more
> sophisticated embodiment, can be one of the previous message of this particular calling
> party which has been stored and identified in SDP 50 for calling party 22. If file
> attachment is not desired, processing continues with the steps shown in FIG. 2B. If file
> attachment is desired, the prompter & collector permits calling party 22 to select the
> prestored message at step 238. In this regard, prompter & collector can either simply
> request calling party 22 to enter an identifier or code for the prestored message, or (at

- 16 -

> subscriber option) can play a repertoire of prestored messages and permit calling party 22 to select therefrom. In addition, after the prestored message (e.g., attached file) has been selected, the prompter & collector inquires at step 240 whether the attached file needs to be translated from a first language to a second language. If an affirmative response is received from calling party 22, step 242 is conducted. At step 242, the prompter & collector can present a menu for selection of the second language. In response to the second language selection, the prestored message is translated (e.g., from Swedish to English, for example). Otherwise, if language translation is not required, execution continues with the steps shown in FIG. 2B.

In this section, Dahlén discloses that the calling party can attach a file to a message. Dahlén discloses that this file can be one or more routine messages or a previous message of this calling party. Applicants assume that the Examiner is alleging that the file is equivalent to the "one or more message attachments" recited in claim 1. Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that this allegation is reasonable, nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Dahlén disclose or suggest, for example, translating the file from a source attachment format into attachment text, as would be required by claim 1.

At column 7, lines 10-25, Dahlén discloses:

> Speech/text converter 80 records the voice message from calling party 22 and temporarily stores the voice message which is incrementally converted to text. After the voice message is received, converter 80 plays an announcement that the calling party 22 should hang up and that his/her text message will be transmitted (see step 272 of FIG. 2B). Converter 80 notifies SCP 40 upon completion of the speech to text conversion. If requested by calling party at steps 240 and 242, as Event E8 the SCP 40 issues a language conversion-enable signal on link 44 to speech/text converter 80, which in turn transmits the message text in a first language to language translator 95 along with instructions regarding the translation (from which first language to which second language, for example). Upon completion of language translation, SCP 40 is so advised via speech/text converter 80.

In this section, Dahlén discloses recording a voice message and incrementally converting the voice message to text. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Dahlén disclose or suggest, for example, translating one or more message attachments from a source attachment format into attachment text, as required by claim 1.

- 17 -

Rodriguez et al. also does not disclose or suggest these features of amended claim 1.

Dahlén and Rodriguez et al. also do not disclose or suggest converting the message text and the attachment text to an audible message when the message should be delivered to the receiving party, as further recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner alleged that Dahlén discloses converting a digital text message to an audible message and cited column 9, lines 17-18, of Dahlén for support, but admitted that Dahlén does not specifically disclose converting the digital text message to an audible message when the message should be delivered to the receiving party (Office Action, page 4). The Examiner further alleged that Rodriguez et al. discloses converting a digital text message to an audible message when the message should be delivered to the receiving party and cited paragraph 0028 of Rodriguez et al. for support (Office Action, page 4). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is misconstruing the features of Applicants' claim 1.

Claim 1 recites converting message text, which has been obtained by translating a message from a source message format to the message text, and attachment text, which has been obtained by translating one or more message attachments from a source attachment format to the attachment text, to an audible message when the message should be delivered to the receiving party. Neither Dahlén nor Rodriguez et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or remotely suggests these features.

At column 9, lines 16-18, Dahlén discloses:

> In the embodiment illustrated in FIG. 4, speech/text converter 80 performs conversion of a text message to a speech message.

- 18 -

In this section, <u>Dahlén</u> discloses an embodiment where a calling party selects one of a number of prestored text messages and the selected text message is converted to voice and delivered as a voice message to the called party(ies) (col. 9, lines 33-44). <u>Dahlén</u> does not disclose or remotely suggest that the prestored text message was obtained by translating a message from a source message format to message text or by translating one or more message attachments from a source attachment format to attachment text, as would be required by claim 1. Thus, nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does <u>Dahlén</u> disclose or suggest converting message text, which has been obtained by translating a message from a source message format to the message text, and attachment text, which has been obtained by translating one or more message attachments from a source attachment format to the attachment text, to an audible message when the message should be delivered to the receiving party, as required by claim 1.

In paragraph 0028, <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> discloses:

> In other embodiments, such as the one shown in Figure 1b, telephone answering system 140 is connected to the user's telephone through telephone network 110. For example, in a mobile telephone system the voicemail system is separate from the individual mobile telephones that use the network. In a mobile telephone system, the mobile telephone network connects the mobile telephone voicemail with the individual mobile telephones. Likewise, a voicemail system used by an organization often connects to individuals' phones using the organization's internal telephone network, often managed by one or more specialized computers (i.e. a PBX). In these systems, telephone answering system 140 dials (step 160) urgent message recipient 170 using telephone network 110. Receiver 120 from FIG. 1a may be the same person as recipient 170, or may be another person designated by the receiver to receive messages. If urgent message recipient 170 answers, urgent message 130 is played so the recipient receives the urgent message in a timely manner. In addition, if the stored message is a digital text message, the message may be converted to an audible message using speech synthesis software depending on the type of device the recipient is using. If the recipient is receiving his messages from a traditional telephone, any digital text messages would be converted to an audible signal using the voice synthesis software. However, if the recipient is using a device with a text display, such as a mobile telephone or a PDA, then the digital message may appear on the device rather than converting the text message into an audible message.

- 19 -

In this section, Rodriguez et al. discloses that a stored digital text message can be converted to an audible message using speech synthesis software. Rodriguez et al. does not disclose or remotely suggest that this digital text message was obtained by translating a message from a source message format to message text or by translating one or more message attachments from a source attachment format to attachment text, as would be required by claim 1. Thus, nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Rodriguez et al. disclose or suggest converting message text, which has been obtained by translating a message from a source message format to the message text, and attachment text, which has been obtained by translating one or more message attachments from a source attachment format to the attachment text, to an audible message when the message should be delivered to the receiving party, as required by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Dahlén and Rodriguez et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claims 2-7, 9-11, 16, and 17 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable over Dahlén and Rodriguez et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Amended independent claim 19 recites features similar to, but possibly different in scope from, features recited in claim 1. Claim 19 is, therefore, patentable over Dahlén and Rodriguez et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Amended independent claim 20 is directed to a message delivery system. The system comprises a message receiver configured to obtain a message with one or more message attachments intended for a receiving party, the message being obtained in a source message format and the one or more message attachments being obtained in a source attachment format,

- 20 -

determine whether the message should be delivered to the receiving party, convert the message

from the source message format to a target format when the message should be delivered to the

receiving party, and convert the one or more message attachments from the source attachment

format into the target format. The system also comprises a call processor configured to convert

the message from the target format to an audible format, initiate a telephony call to the receiving

party at a time specified by the receiving party, and deliver the message in the audible format to

the receiving party during the telephony call.

Neither <u>Dahlén</u> nor <u>Rodriguez et al.</u>, whether taken alone or in any reasonable

combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 20. For example,

neither <u>Dahlén</u> nor <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> discloses or suggests a message receiver that is configured to

convert one or more message attachments from a source attachment format into a target format.

The Examiner alleged that <u>Dahlén</u> discloses these features and cited column 6, lines 5-32,

and column 7, lines 10-25, of <u>Dahlén</u> for support (Office Action, page 3). Applicants

respectfully disagree for at least reasons similar to reasons given above with regard to claim 1.

<u>Dahlén</u> and <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> also do not disclose or suggest a call processor that is

configured to convert a message from the target format to an audible format, as further recited in

claim 20.

The Examiner alleged that <u>Dahlén</u> discloses converting a digital text message to an

audible message and cited column 9, lines 17-18, of <u>Dahlén</u> for support, but admitted that <u>Dahlén</u>

does not specifically disclose converting the digital text message to an audible message when the

message should be delivered to the receiving party (Office Action, page 4). The Examiner

further alleged that <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> discloses converting a digital text message to an audible

- 21 -

PATENT
Application Serial No. 10/016,551
Docket No. 01-8007RCE1

message when the message should be delivered to the receiving party and cited paragraph 0028 of Rodriguez et al. for support (Office Action, page 4). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is misconstruing the features of Applicants' claim 20.

Claim 20 recites a call processor that is configured to convert a message from a target format, into which the message was previously converted from a source message format, to an audible format. Neither Dahlén nor Rodriguez et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or remotely suggests these features for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 20 is patentable over Dahlén and Rodriguez et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claims 21-29, 31, 34, and 35 depend from claim 20 and are, therefore, patentable over Dahlén and Rodriguez et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 20.

Amended independent claim 42 is directed to a method for providing enhanced message services. The method comprises prior to monitoring messages, interacting with a user to generate a user profile that identifies at least one message criterion that indicates when the messages should be delivered to the user; monitoring a message server for arrival of new messages intended for the user; processing the new messages, including: determining whether the new messages should be delivered to the user based on the user profile, translating the new messages from a source format to a text format, and converting the new messages from the text format to an audible format, as audible messages, when the new messages should be delivered to the user; and delivering the audible messages to the user based on the at least one message criterion,

- 22 -

including: initiating a telephony call to the user, and presenting the audible messages to the user during the telephony call.

Neither Dahlén nor Rodriguez et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 42. For example, neither Dahlén nor Rodriguez et al. discloses or suggests converting new messages from a text format, into which the new messages were previously translated from a source format, to an audible format, as audible messages, when the new messages should be delivered to the user.

The Examiner rejected claim 42 by generally referring to the rejection of claims 1 and 5 (Office Action, page 8). Applicants respectfully submit that Dahlén and Rodriguez et al. do not disclose or suggest at least the above-identified feature of claim 42 for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claims 1 and 20.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 42 is patentable over Dahlén and Rodriguez et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claims 45-47 depend from claim 42 and are, therefore, patentable over Dahlén and Rodriguez et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 42.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-11, 16, 17, 19-29, 31, 34, 35, 42, and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Dahlén and Rodriguez et al.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON
DAHLÉN, RODRIGUEZ ET AL., AND TULLIS ET AL.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 14, 15, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over <u>Dahlén</u> in view of <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u> Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 1. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection with regard to claims 14 and 15, Applicants submit that the disclosure of <u>Tullis et al.</u> does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of <u>Dahlén</u> and <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> identified above with regard to claim 1. Therefore, claims 14 and 15 are patentable over <u>Dahlén, Rodriguez et al.,</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u> for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Claims 32 and 33 depend from claim 20. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection with regard to claims 32 and 33, Applicants submit that the disclosure of <u>Tullis et al.</u> does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of <u>Dahlén</u> and <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> identified above with regard to claim 20. Therefore, claims 32 and 33 are patentable over <u>Dahlén, Rodriguez et al.,</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u> for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14, 15, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Dahlén, Rodriguez et al.,</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u>

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON DAHLÉN, RODRIGUEZ ET AL., AND FORTMAN ET AL.

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18, 36, 43, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over <u>Dahlén</u> in view of <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> and <u>Fortman et al.</u> Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

- 24 -

Claims 18, 36, 43, and 44 variously depend from claims 1, 20, and 42. Without

acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection with regard to claims 18, 36, 43, and 44, Applicants

submit that the disclosure of Fortman et al. does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of

Dahlén and Rodriguez et al. identified above with regard to claims 1, 20, and 42. Therefore,

claims 18, 36, 43, and 44 are patentable over Dahlén, Rodriguez et al., and Fortman et al. for at

least the reasons given with regard to claims 1, 20, and 42.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the

rejection of claims 18, 36, 43, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Dahlén, Rodriguez et al.,

and Fortman et al.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON DAHLÉN AND TULLIS ET AL.

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 37-40, 48, and 49 under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Dahlén in view of Tullis et al. Applicants

respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 37 is directed to a computer-readable medium that stores

instructions executable by at least one computer to perform a method for presenting a message to

a receiving party. The computer-readable medium comprises instructions for obtaining a

message intended for the receiving party, the message including one or more message

attachments; instructions for determining whether the one or more message attachments are

convertible into a target format; instructions for translating the one or more message attachments

into the target format when the one or more message attachments are convertible into the target

format; instructions for generating a description of the one or more message attachments when

the one or more message attachments are not convertible into the target format; instructions for

- 25 -

initiating a voice call to the receiving party at a predetermined date and time identified by the

receiving party; and instructions for presenting the message with the one or more attachments or

the generated description to the receiving party during the voice call.

Neither Dahlén nor Tullis et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination,

discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 37. For example, neither

Dahlén nor Tullis et al. discloses or suggests instructions for initiating a voice call to the

receiving party at a predetermined date and time identified by the receiving party.

The Examiner alleged that Dahlén discloses this feature and cited column 7, line 45 -

column 8, line 29; column 8, lines 42-53; column 9, lines 61-67; and column 10, lines 11-48, of

Dahlén for support (Office Action, page 12). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants have carefully studied each of the sections identified by the Examiner and

respectfully submit that none of the sections, or any other portion of the Dahlén disclosure,

supports the Examiner's allegation. In fact, Dahlén discloses something quite different from

instructions for initiating a voice call to the receiving party at a predetermined date and time

identified by the receiving party. For example, at column 9, lines 61-67, Dahlén discloses:

> As part of the dialogue, prompter & collector 70, 72 provide a series of audible menus.
> The menus include menus to select a desired prestored text message; menus to select a
> distribution list of called party(ies) to whom the message is to be delivered; and, a menu
> (optional) which permits calling party 22 to select delivery of the message either
> immediately or at a target time selected by calling party 22.

Thus, Dahlén discloses permitting the calling party to select a target time for delivery of a

message to a called party. Tullis et al. also does not disclose or suggest instructions for initiating

a voice call to the receiving party at a predetermined date and time identified by the receiving

party.

- 26 -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 37 is patentable over <u>Dahlén</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u>, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claims 38-40 depend from claim 37 and are, therefore, patentable over <u>Dahlén</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u> for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 37.

Amended independent claim 48 recites features similar to, but possibly different in scope from, features recited in claim 37. Claim 48 is, therefore, patentable over <u>Dahlén</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u>, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 37.

Claim 49 depends from claim 48 and is, therefore, patentable over <u>Dahlén</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u> for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 48.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 37-40, 48, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on <u>Dahlén</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u>

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON
<u>DAHLÉN</u>, <u>TULLIS ET AL.</u>, AND <u>RODRIGUEZ ET AL.</u>

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over <u>Dahlén</u> in view of <u>Tullis et al.</u> and <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 41 depends from claim 37. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection with regard to claim 41, Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of <u>Dahlén</u> and <u>Tullis et al.</u> identified above with regard to claim 37. Claim 41 is, therefore, patentable over <u>Dahlén</u>, <u>Tullis et al.</u>, and <u>Rodriguez et al.</u> for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 37.

- 27 -

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the

rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Dahlén, Tullis et al., and Rodriguez et al.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the

reconsideration of this application and the allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is

hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 07-2347 and please credit any excess

fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.

By: _____
Joel Wall
Reg. No. 25,648

Date: May 10, 2006

600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03H14
Irving, Texas 75038
Tel: 972-718-4800
Fax: 972-718-3946
Customer No. 32127

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent
Office at 571-273-8300.

Dated: May 10, 2006   Signature _____ (Christian R. Andersen)

- 28 -